

REMARKS

ADD DRAWING DISCUSSION Claims 17-24, 31-44 and 51-78 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 17, 18, 31, 37, 38, 41 and 51 are amended; claims 25-30 and 45-50 are canceled; and new claims 57-78 are added. The specification is amended to address an objection to the specification. Claim 37 is amended to address claim objection, and claim 41 is amended to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment. The features added to claims 18 and 38 and new claims 58, 64 and 72 find support in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 3, lines 9, 10, 30 and 31 and page 7, lines 7 and 8. The features added to claims 31 and 51 find support in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 6, lines 29 and 30 and page 7, lines 24-26. New claim 57 finds support in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 3, lines 9-11 and page 7, lines 7-9. New claims 59-62 finds support in canceled claims 13, 25 and 45 and in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 3, lines 5-8 and page 7, lines 11-15. New claims 63 and 71 find support in canceled claim 25 and in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 3, lines 9-11 and page 7, lines 7-9. New claims 65 and 73 find support in canceled claims 1 and 14-16, as originally filed, and in the specification, as originally filed, at, for example page 3 lines 14-21 and page 4, lines 1-7. New claims 66-70 and new claims 74-78 find support in canceled claims 26-30, respectively.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Drawing Objections

The Patent Office alleges that the drawings submitted on January 29, 2008 are not acceptable because the drawings allegedly fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Specifically,

the Patent Office alleges that the new sheets of drawings must be labeled in the top margin as “New Sheet” and that the elements of the drawings should have descriptive titles.

Applicant submits herewith

II. Specification Objections

The specification was objected to for alleged informalities because the specification makes reference to “the preamble of claim 1” and for allegedly failing to include section headings therein.

The specification was amended, as suggested by the Patent Office, to (a) remove the phrase “the preamble of claim 1” from the specification, (b) include section headings, and (c) correct grammatical, idiomatic and typographical errors. Applicants submit that the specification supports the claims and not vice versa. Additionally, Applicants submit that references to the claims were removed from the specification.

As such, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Objection

Claims 2-5 were objected to for alleged informalities. Specifically, the Patent Office suggests adding “the support bracket comprises bearing journals extending downwardly from a longitudinal side of the support bracket, each receiving a corresponding recess of the T-shape profile for attaching the Bowden cable connection to the support bracket” to claim 2 to provide a good explanation of how the recess allow the Bowden connector to be attached to the support bracket. The Patent Office also suggested canceling claim 3 and amending claims 4 and 5 to depend from claim 2.

Applicants amended claim 2 to incorporate the above language suggested by the Patent Office into claim 2, amended claims 4 and 5 to depend from claim 2 and canceled claim 3.

In view of the amendments to claims 2, 4 and 5 and the cancellation of claim 3, Applicants submit that the claim objections are moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleges that claims 1-12 fail to conform with U.S. practice, contain grammatical and idiomatic errors, and present antecedent basis issues for features therein. Additionally, the Patent Office alleges that, in view of claim 2, it is unclear how the recess is for attaching the connector to the support bracket because there is no limitation claimed previously so as to one of ordinary skill in the art would see the attachment. The Patent Office directs Applicants to the claim objection to claim 2 to clarify how the recess is for attaching the connector to the support bracket.

In view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 3, this rejection is moot with respect to those claims.

Claims 2 and 4-12 were amended to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action. Claim 2 was amended to clarify how the recess allows the Bowden connector to be attached to the support bracket as suggest by the Patent Office in the claim objection section of the present Office Action. Moreover, claims 2 and 4-12 were amended to conform with current U.S. practice and to provide antecedent basis for features recited in the claims and to correct typographical, grammatical and idiomatic errors therein.

Applicants submit that amended claims 2 and 4-12 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated DE 10016243 to Meyer. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 91 is canceled. Thus, this rejection is moot.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Meyer. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 12 depends from amended independent claim 2, which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Meyer.

As acknowledged by the Patent Office's failure to reject claims 2 and 3 in view of Meyer, Meyer does not teach or suggest a support bracket having the features of canceled claims 1 and 3 and original claim 2 as required by amended claim 2.

Because the features of independent claim 2 are neither taught nor suggested by Meyer, Meyer cannot anticipate, and would not have rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the features specifically defined in amended claim 2 and its dependent claims.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is patentable over Meyer. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2 and 4-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Brian C. Anscomb/

Brian C. Anscomb
Reg. No. 48,641
875 Third Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844